

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 17-25 as being anticipated by Centers et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,471,486) or as being unpatentable over Centers et al. Applicants traverse the rejection in light of the declaration submitted herewith establishing invention prior to the prior art date of Centers et al. Accordingly, Centers et al. is not to be considered prior art by the Examiner in making his rejections.

Because Centers et al. is not prior art, the Examiner's rejections are deemed moot by Applicants, who respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejections.

Applicants have corrected a typographical error in Claim 17. This amendment is not considered to narrow the scope of the claim.

The Applicants have also added new Claims 26-30, which depend from claims previously examined. The new claims are considered by Applicants to be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION


It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the

Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 16, 2003

By: _____


Michael Malinzak
Reg. No. 43,770

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MM:ca